

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- June 15, 1966

Appeal No. 8790 Thomas F. Tepper et ux, appellants

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on June 22, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: September 21, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the provisions of Section 7205 to permit open parking space in front of single-family dwelling at 4241 Mathewson Drive, N.W., lot 880, Square 2642, be denied.

As a result of an inspection of the property and from the record and the evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

- (1) Appellants' property is located in an R-1-A District.
- (2) The property was inspected by the Board on June 13, 1966.
- (3) The Board found the property difficult to identify as the area was heavily wooded and no street addresses were readily ascertainable. Along the street, there was a very steep rise above grade.
- (4) Appellants' lot has an 85 foot frontage on Mathewson Drive, N.W. The lot has an irregular shape with a north lot line of 143 feet, an east lot line of 75 feet, and a south line of 187.22 feet. The area of the lot is 11,828.95 square feet.
- (5) Appellant proposes to erect a single family dwelling and have the required parking in front of the building.
- (6) Section 7205 requires that parking spaces must be provided  
"(a) Within a rear yard; or, within a side yard."
- (7) There is no alley adjacent to the subject property and access to the lot must be from Mathewson Drive.
- (8) Appellant states that there is a difference in grade of about 30 feet from the northwest corner of the lot to the southeast corner.
- (9) There was opposition to the granting of this appeal. The record contains four (4) letters in opposition. The Crestwood Citizens Association opposes the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

It is the opinion of the Board that the appellant has failed to prove a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations. Although the testimony substantiates the fact that there are grade problems in the area of appellant's property, there is considerable evidence to support the conclusion that the problems are such that off-street parking can be provided on the site within the terms of the Zoning Regulations. Appellants' problem is not unique to his lot, and other houses have been built in the area with the same grade problem and have constructed garages to provide the parking within the requirements of the Regulations. It is the Board's view that the appellant can provide off-street parking within the Regulations without suffering any real hardship.